

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of November 19, 2007 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

The Examiner mentions that claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 13, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30-37, 44, 46, 48, 49, 55, 57, 59, 60, and 66-100 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 21, 37, 46, 57, 76, 83, 90 and 96 are amended herein to clarify the instant claims. Consequently, claims 1, 8-10, 12, 13, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30-37, 44, 46, 48, 49, 55, 57, 59, 60, 66-70, and 71-100 remain pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesies extended during the Examiner's interview of May 29, 2008. For the reasons advanced in the interview and below, Applicants contend that the instant application is now in a condition for allowance.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claims 31-36 and 67-70. It would appear that claims 71 and 72 should likewise be allowed since these claims depend from allowed claim 67. As a result, claims 31-36 and 67-72 should be designated as allowed.

Claims 76, 83, 90 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner contends that there is no basis in the application as filed for the limitation "top gate type thin film transistor." Applicants contend that Figure 10 provides sufficient support for this limitation. However, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 76, 83, 90 and 96 are amended herein to recite that the gate electrode is formed over the channel region. This limitation is clearly supported by the specification and Figure 10, and thus, should be considered sufficient for overcoming this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 37, 46, 48-49 and 70-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chae (U.S. 5,432,122). Applicants continue to contend that Chae fails

to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the claims recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways.

Chae, as previously admitted by the Patent Office in at least the Office Actions mailed on May 24, 2002 and November 30, 2001, fails to teach the scanning direction of the laser beam as parallel to the channel direction as recited by Applicants' claims. However, the Examiner now contends that Chae discloses the scanning direction is parallel to the channel region by considering the claims in their broadest possible context.

In order to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 10, 21, 37, 46 and 57 are amended herein to include an allowable feature of the allowed claims, namely, that the scan direction is orthogonal to the gate electrode and is parallel to the channel region. Chae discloses that the gate (22) extends along the scanning direction (e.g., see FIG. 7). The scanning direction of Chae is **not** (emphasis added) parallel but perpendicular to the carrier flow direction of the channel region. Thus, Chae teaches away from the invention, as claimed.

As noted during the interview, the Examiner indicated that such an amendment would be sufficient for placing this application in a condition for allowance and would be entered after final rejection since new issues are not added. Consequently, claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 13, 19, 21, 23, 24, 30, 37, 44, 46, 48, 49, 55, 57, 59, 60, 66, 73-100 should be in a condition for allowance.

Claims 8, 18, 44, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chae in view of Imahashi et al. (US 5,413,958). Claims 21, 23, 24, 57, 59, 60 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chae in view of Weiner et al. (US 5,413,958). Claims 30 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chae and Weiner et al. in view of Imahashi et al. Chae, Imahashi et al., and Weiner et al., however, fail to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the claims recites a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the

prior art in different ways. Thus, any depending claims which rely on this feature are also not disclosed by Chae, since the secondary references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Chae.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore request the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned patent attorney at (202) 585-8207.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Jeffrey L. Costellia #35,483/
Jeffrey L. Costellia

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080